

March 11, 1975

called upon to contribute that part of the money, and that much money that we need for the budget, not what has gone on in the past. That income tax coming now, based on next years due money, does not belong to the State of Nebraska. If you had a business, or had a job and adversity met you and you had to get your income tax back, that income tax that you deposited with the State of Nebraska had very well better be there so it can be paid back to you, rather than taken from you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I'm not a fiscal specialist, nor do I know whether 202 should be bracketed or not. It's fun to watch us when they're passing legislation that requires money. When we're passing legislation that applies to cities small or large, or counties, we don't take too much care in what we're doing. In other words, we don't care too much. We're not going to have to be the ones to pay for it. Here's a bill that the committee has studied and said apparently that the state could assume the responsibility for paying for this. All of a sudden we put the brakes on. Now it makes a difference as to whose paying the bill. What I'm saying, therefore, is this in the future, in this session, when we're passing laws that apply to cities, villages and counties where they are paying the bills perhaps we ought to be just as careful when we're doing that as we are today when we are accepting a responsibility for this.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think it would be a mistake to bracket the bill. I think its introducers pointed out the amount of money that is necessary to operate state government must be determined and then the appropriations must be handled accordingly. There is no guarantee here on the part of our good friend, my good friend Senator Cavanaugh, that if we bracket this bill that he's going to be similarly responsible in other areas. As Senator Nichol has pointed out, the responsibility depends entirely upon who pays. Unfortunately, and I think Senator Bereuter made a good point when he said that the counties will have a greater interest in who is on welfare, etc. if they are fiscally responsible for a part of the cost. It's a good point. Unfortunately, we at the state level mandate what the counties must do in this area time, after time, after time. We give the county very little flexibility. Then if the state, by virtue of our refusal to pass legislation that is realistic, do not take care of those needs there is no recourse for the county except to take care of those needs, because the people reside in that area. The counties must then pick up the load. They're not going to put people out on the street or let them go without food. The counties have the same problems that the state has; with one additional problem that is, as has been referred to, the constitutional limit on levy. They have to work under that. They have no other recourse. We have given to certain cities a little